

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over AAPA. Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over AAPA as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Van Hal et al (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0172839). Claims 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA as applied to claim 1 above, and claim 14, and further in view of Chan (US Patent 5,055,894). Claims 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Chan as applied to claim 12 above, and claim 14, and further in view of Van. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner states that AAPA discloses in figure 3, a top-emitting OLED display comprising: a) a substrate 20; b) an array of OLED light emissive elements 10 formed over the substrate; c) an encapsulating cover 38 located over the OLED light emissive elements; and d) a circular light polarizer 50 located between the encapsulating cover and the OLED light emissive elements. There is clearly no described "admitted prior art", however, such that Fig. 3 should be interpreted as disclosing an OLED display in a manner as proposed by the Examiner. A closer inspection of Fig. 3 (and the associated text) rather shows that the encapsulating cover of such display (i.e., the element which is attached to the substrate so as to encapsulate the OLED elements 10) is clearly identified as element 36 (affixed to substrate 20 with adhesive 70), not element 38. Polarizer 50 is clearly shown and described as being provided on top of the encapsulating cover 36, not between the encapsulating cover and the OLED elements as required by claim 1. Element 38 is clearly identified as an optional protective cover provided over the polarizer 50, not as the encapsulating cover. Thus, "admitted prior art" Fig. 3 does not anticipate the invention of claim 1.

Regarding claim 14, the Examiner states that AAPA discloses the limitations in the claim, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, except for a material located adjacent to the first surface layer of the circular light polarizer having a refractive index matched more closely than air to the reflective index of the first surface layer of the circular light polarizer, and that it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make the reflective index of the layer 36 match the reflective index of the polarizer so as not to interfere with the direction of the emitted light from the polarizer. As discussed above, however, Fig. 3 relied upon by the Examiner does not disclose the limitations of the claim, as element 38 is not an encapsulating cover, and as the polarizer 50 is not provided between the OLED elements 10 and the encapsulating cover (element 36) of the depicted device. Accordingly, the claimed invention is clearly not taught or suggested by the cited “admitted prior art”.

The additional cited references do not overcome the basic deficiencies of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 14, and accordingly all of claims 1-18 are believed in condition for allowance. The following additional comments are also provided for further distinction.

Regarding claim 6, the Examiner states that the circular light polarizer 50 is attached to the OLED light emissive elements in Fig. 3 by means of layer 36. To the contrary, the polarizer 50 is separated from the OLED elements 10 by encapsulating cover 36. Regarding claim 9, the Examiner states that the cover (38) is hermetically sealed to the substrate by means of element 36 (and 50). Again, it is encapsulating cover 36 which is sealed to the substrate, not optional protective cover 38, which is optionally provided over polarizer 50 which is provided over encapsulating cover 36.

Regarding claims 2 and 3, the Examiner states that AAPA discloses the limitations in the claims, as discussed above, except for the encapsulating cover defines a cavity over the OLED elements and the circular light polarizer is attached to the encapsulating cover inside the cavity, that Van discloses in figure 1, an encapsulating cover 7 defines a cavity 8 over the OLED's 3, and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make a cavity with a cover over the OLED of the device of the AAPA in order to avoid direct contact with the light emitting layer. While Van does indeed show a cavity between the OLEDs 3 and the encapsulating cover 7, combining such teaching with AAPA Fig. 3 so that encapsulating cover 36 of Fig. 3 would form a cavity would still not result in the present claimed invention, as polarizer 50 of Fig. 3 provided above encapsulating cover 36 would still be provided outside of any cavity formed with encapsulating cover 36. Again, element 38 is not the encapsulating cover of the described device of Fig. 3.

Regarding claims 10 and 11, the Examiner states that a desiccant material 9 is located around a periphery of the cover 7 in the Van reference. Applicant cannot find such a teaching as alleged by the Examiner. Rather, moisture-absorption sheet 9 is depicted in Fig. 1 as being located in a central area of the cover 7. Further, there is additionally clearly no teaching of defining a peripheral channel in the cover and locating the desiccant in the peripheral channel.

Regarding claims 12 and 17, while Chan may disclose in figure 17 an anti-reflective coating layer 106 formed over light emitting diodes, there is no teaching or suggestion to provide such a coating over an encapsulating cover of an organic light emitting diode display. Rather, such coating is provided on the opposite side of a substrate 80 upon which inorganic LEDs are formed..

Regarding Claims 13 and 18, it is further noted that providing an antireflective coating on the side of an encapsulating cover opposite to the OLED elements and moving the coating 9 of Van to be positioned over or with such an antireflective coating as apparently suggested by the Examiner would defeat the objective of Van to provide moisture absorption sheet 9 within the encapsulation cavity.

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested. A prompt and favorable action by the Examiner is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe any remaining issues may be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative at the number below to discuss such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew J. Anderson  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 33,564

Andrew J. Anderson/vjr  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: (585) 722-9662  
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.